



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Soon after Judge Story's appointment the corporation purchased his library consisting of over 1,000 volumes, the students having been kindly permitted the use of his books previous to such purchase. The books thus obtained, with the few works on law previously mentioned, formed the nucleus from which the law library as a separate collection has grown; the 3,100 volumes of 1833 having increased to more than ten times that number in 1893.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL OF MASSACHUSETTS. — CORRECTION. Last month the REVIEW adopted the Attorney-General's statement that *Com. v. Trefethen* was the first case where a capital conviction had been reversed in Massachusetts. It now appears that in *Com. v. Hardy*, 2 Mass. 303, a capital conviction secured before Supreme Court sitting *in banc* was reversed by them, and upon a second trial the prisoner was acquitted. So *Com. v. Trefethen* is at least not the first case.

COUNSEL AND COURT. — It has often been regretted that American methods of reporting do not reach the colloquy between judges and counsel in the course of the argument. Lately, in England, a manufacturer who had bought belting for his machinery "warranted for ten years," insisted upon using it after it was useless, and in order to sue each year for the accruing damages. When his counsel appeared in court to press this claim the following dialogue took place: —

Lord Coleridge: "And you actually insist that your client, the plaintiff, may go on using a thing which he says is of no use, not for the purpose of using it, but for the purpose of bringing repeated actions for his not being able to use it; and that, too, notwithstanding an offer to take it back and return the money?" *Chitty* (for the plaintiff): "Yes, that is our claim." *Lord Coleridge*: "Then we will try if the law will not enable us to resist it." *Chitty*: "This is not a court of morals but a court of law." *Lord Coleridge*: "True, and what is morality is not always law; but the law ought to be in accordance with morality; and we will try and see if it be not so here. . . ." (10 Times Law Reports, 225.) And the court dismissed the claim. Surely no opinion sent down in cold writing, after the argument, could so effectually dispose of the idea that there is any right to heap up damages for others to pay, unless, as in *Shylock's* case, it is "so nominated in the bond," and, perhaps, — as in *Shylock's* case, — not then.

THE REFERENDUM. — That provision of the Constitution of Massachusetts which enables the Legislature to consult the Supreme Court upon judicial questions of importance has recently been put in use to obtain opinions upon what is known as the referendum. The Legislature asked whether it was constitutional to provide that an act (one granting suffrage to women) should take effect (1) throughout the Commonwealth, (2) in cities and towns, upon acceptance by voters; and also whether it could provide that women specially registered might vote upon the first question. The bare majority answered in the negative, Knowlton, J., with them on the first and third questions; Holmes and Barker, JJ., dissenting altogether. The majority base their answer upon the theory that